

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

In the Office Action dated July 24, 2006, the Examiner has rejected the pending claims 1-14. More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Banatre (2002/0028683). Respectfully, we traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-14 have been amended for clarification. Claims 1, 7 and 12-14 have been amended to address the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections for indefiniteness. No new matter is added.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for authenticating a user of an electronic device in a plurality of usage contexts the user is able to use with the electronic device, the method comprising: maintaining a centralized register of the usage contexts available for the electronic device and pre-stored user profiles, each user profile being associated with at least one usage context, the electronic device entering a particular one of said plurality of usage contexts, said particular one being a selected usage context, the electronic device identifying said entering, selecting from the centralized register a user profile in response to said identifying, and performing authentication in the selected usage context by using data from the selected user profile.

The amended claim 1 addresses the insufficient antecedent basis as pointed out by the Examiner in the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Respectfully, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and remove the rejection of claim 1 as merely clarified by amendment. In addition, as the claims 7 and 12-14 have been similarly clarified, the rejection should be removed for all the claims 1, 7 and 12-14.

The Examiner rejects the claims 1-14 under 35 USC 102(e) over Banatre. Banatre discloses a system in which a user portable set communicates with a mobile station and an access interface to access a context-sensitive service that is adapted according to a position of the user portable set and/or identity of a user of a portable set (par.[0066] and [0070]). In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner states in the office action that Banatre anticipates claim 1 in paragraphs [0027] to [0031]. Respectfully, we traverse the rejection.

Banatre discloses that “the remote server communicates to the user portable set via the access infrastructure all the relevant service identifiers matching the request and from which the user selects the service identifier of his choice” (par. [0031]). The present invention progresses beyond the disclosure of Banatre as such, beyond the point in which a particular one of a plurality of usage contexts has been selected, or becomes **“a selected usage context”** as claim 1 recites in part. Banatre does not anticipate claim 1, as claim 1 further recites in part **“selecting from the centralized register a user profile in response to said identifying, and performing authentication in the selected usage context by using data from the selected user profile.”**

Banatre does not disclose, teach or suggest **“selecting from the centralized register a user profile in response to said identifying”** as claim 1 recites in part. Furthermore, Banatre does not disclose, teach or suggest **“performing authentication in the selected usage context by using data from the selected user profile”** as claim 1 recites in part. Therefore, Banatre does not anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 should be allowed.


In addition, as the independent claims 7, 13 and 14 also incorporate similar features as claim 1, for the reasons above, claims 7, 13 and 14 are not anticipated by Banatre. Therefore, claims 7, 13 and 14 should be allowed. Furthermore, for at least the reason that claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, and claims 8-12 depend from claim 7; the claims 2-6, and 8-12 are not anticipated by Banatre. For these reasons all the claims 1-14 of the present invention should be allowed.



S.N. 10/608,235
Art Unit 2132

The Examiner is respectfully requested to review the claims in view of the above arguments, to withdraw the rejections and to pass claims 1-14 to issue. The undersigned representative welcomes the opportunity to resolve any matters that may remain, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner's discretion.

Respectfully submitted:



Harry F. Smith
Reg. No.: 32,493

October 10, 2006

Date


Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Phone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: hsmith@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

October 11, 2006

Date



Name of Person Making Deposit